



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Den
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/659,659	09/10/2003	Nathaniel Christopher Herwig	11388.00	3696
26884	7590	09/12/2006	EXAMINER	
PAUL W. MARTIN				LABAZE, EDWYN
NCR CORPORATION, LAW DEPT.				
1700 S. PATTERSON BLVD.				
DAYTON, OH 45479-0001				
				ART UNIT
				PAPER NUMBER
				2876

DATE MAILED: 09/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/659,659	HERWIG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	EDWYN LABAZE	2876	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 6/22/2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Receipt is acknowledged of appeal brief filed on 6/22/2006.
2. After carefully reviewing the appellant's arguments with regards the prior art of record in the final office action, the examiner is herewith withdrawn the rejection as set forth in paper No. 10192005, in light of newly found references {U.S. 6,947,171 of Narusawa et al.} and/or interpretations of the claimed invention. The examiner regrets any inconvenience to the applicant. Accordingly, **the PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED**. A new ground of rejection is set forth below.
3. Claims 1-8 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. Claims 1-2 and 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narusawa et al. (U.S. 6,947,171) in view of Herwig (U.S. 6,701,192).

Re claims 1-2, 7-8: Narusawa et al. discloses multifunction printer, computer, printing system and recording medium, which includes a housing for containing two normally separately housed peripherals for saving space at a terminal including a receipt printer 24/34 and a bar code reader {herein card reader 26/36 or image scanner 76/86; as shown in figs. # 14-15}; and control circuitry {herein USB hubs 22, 32} in the housing for facilitating communication of receipt data between the printer and a separately {herein Narusawa et al. teaches that the multifunction printer holding identification information indicating that the data acquiring device and the printing device are held in a common housing, the computer being capable of recognizing the data acquiring device and the printing device independently, even when they are held in a single housing of a multifunction printer} housed controlling transaction computer and bar code data between the bar code reader and the separately housed controlling transaction computer over a single cable {herein USB cable 40, 42} (col.2, lines 53-67; col.3, lines 10+; col.12, lines 55+; col.14, lines 34+). Narusawa et al. further teaches a computer peripheral {herein host computer 10} (col.5, lines 8+).

Narusawa et al. fails to specifically teach that the system is used at a checkout station during a sale of products completed by the transaction computer.

Herwig teaches wiring hub for a retail terminal, which includes a checkout station {herein described as a point-of-sale/POS retail terminal, kiosk, self-service for providing or enabling sale transactions} during a sale of products completed by the transaction computer (see fig. # 2; col.1, lines 10+; col.5, lines 55+; col.6, lines 10+).

In view of Herwig's teachings, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the invention was made to employ into the teachings of Narusawa et al. a checkout station and a receipt printer for completing sale transaction of products. Furthermore, such modification would enable means of scanning a product's label/barcode, decoding and outputting product information, and means of accepting, computing currency exchange {i.e. displaying price of the product, entering currency tendered, and computing customer's change back if available, and printing previous steps/functions over customer's receipt} through the receipt printer. Moreover, such modification would have been an obvious extension as taught by Narusawa et al.

Re claim 5: Nasusawa et al. discloses a system and method, wherein the housing was originally designed to only contain the printer, and wherein the bar code reader is located in a position in the housing that does not interfere with operation of the printer (col.14, lines 34-47).

Re claim 6: Narusawa et al. discloses a system and method, wherein the control circuitry comprises a universal serial bus {USB hubs 22, 32} (col.5, lines 16+).

7. Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narusawa et al. (U.S. 6,947,171) as modified by Herwig (U.S. 6,701,192) above in claim 1, and further in view of Zhu et al. (U.S. 6,619,549).

The teachings of Narusawa et al. as modified by Herwig have been discussed above.

Although Narusawa et al. discloses an imaging scanner and a bar code reader, but fail to specifically teach the imaging scanner is a CCD scanner and a presentation scanner.

Zhu et al. discloses barcode symbol reading device having intelligent data communication interface to a host system, which includes a presentation scanner (col.4, lines 5+;

col.11, lines 1+), USB link (col.17, lines 1-67), and a CCD scanner (col.23, lines 30+; col.29, lines 10+).

In view of Zhu et al.'s teachings, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ into the teachings of Narusawa et al. as modified by Herwig a presentation scanner also known in the art as a hand-free/pass-through scanner so as to permit the barcodes to be presented to the scanner with a motion that is parallel to the window. Furthermore, such modification would be beneficial to the user by reducing stress and fatigue of holding to use the [wand] scanner, wherein the presentation scanner is fixedly connected to housing/device while bar coded objects are moved through the scanned field. Moreover, such modification would have been an obvious extension as taught by Narusawa et al. as modified by Herwig, therefore an obvious expedient.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Wilensky (US 2005/0035198) teaches mobile wireless computer system including devices and methods related thereto.

Wike et al. (US 2005/0187826) discloses system and method for operating multiple checkout stations with a single processor.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to EDWYN LABAZE whose telephone number is (571) 272-2395. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM - 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached on (571) 272-2398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

el
Edwyn Labaze
Patent Examiner3
Art Unit 2876
September 4, 2006



MICHAEL G. LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

10/659,659

FIG. 1



